



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/990,005	11/21/2001	Travis J. Parry	10008080-1	2440

7590

03/09/2006

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER

DIVECHA, KAMAL B

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2151

DATE MAILED: 03/09/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/990,005

Applicant(s)

PARRY, TRAVIS J.

Examiner

KAMAL B. DIVECHA

Art Unit

2151

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12/14/05.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Response to Arguments

Claims 1-22 are pending in this application.

Applicant's arguments filed August 3, 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant's definition of Imaging Device

Imaging devices such as printers, projectors, displays, faxes, multi-function copiers, terminals and other such imaging device, are typically networked in modern environment (applicant specification, pg. 1 paragraph 2 and pg. 4-5 paragraph 19).

As evident by the applicant disclosure above, terminals and displays are also known as and/or can be interpreted as imaging devices.

Embedded web server, management facility and http Interface

Based on applicants disclosure (specification page 5, [0020]),

Management facility is defined as in the form of the embedded webserver, and requires the administrator to only surf to the imaging device with a browser to access the management facility (in other words, management facility is simply an http interface or a web page or a web site of an imaging device that can be accessed through the browser).

In the applicant's request for continued examination filed on December 14, 2005 and response filed on October 28, 2005, the applicant argues in substance that:

- a. The management program of Schlonski is not disclosed as being resident on the imaging device being configured, such that the administrator is required to surf across a network with a browser to utilize the management program through the imaging devices embedded webserver. In addition, Schlonski's imaging device displaying the list of other

imaging devices is not disclosed as being **configured itself by the management facility** (See remarks, page 7, page 9).

In response to [a]: Examiner disagrees in light of the following:

First, the amended claims fails to provide any indication whatsoever that the management program is disclosed as being resident on the imaging device being configured. Also, there is no indication in the amended claims of an imaging device displaying a list of other imaging devices as being **configured itself** by the management facility.

Secondly, the management program of Schlonski is disclosed as being resident on the imaging device being configured, such that the administrator is required to surf across a network with a browser to utilize the management program through the imaging devices embedded webserver.

Figure 4 of Schlonski explicitly indicates a system that surfs across a network with a web browser and utilizes the embedded web server of the imaging devices in order to configure or update the configuration of the imaging device (please note that the management program and the embedded webserver is a single entity because management facility is defined as in a form of the embedded web server as per applicant, see above).

Third, the specification fails to provide any support of the aforementioned limitations (see the 35 USC 112, first paragraph rejection).

b. Schlonski fails to teach or disclose a system that communicates a configuration change across a network to a management facility that is accessible through a network interface and an embedded webserver of a first imaging device, selects at least one other imaging device from a list of other imaging devices stored on the first imaging device

Art Unit: 2151

and communicates the configuration change from the imaging device to the at least one other imaging device selected from the list of other imaging devices stored on the first imaging device (remarks, page 7). And therefore, Schlonski fails to teach such a method of configuring plurality of imaging devices coupled to a network (remarks, page 8).

In response to [b]: Examiner disagrees because:

Applicant specification fails to provide an enabling disclosure (see the detailed action below). Secondly, based on applicant specification, Schlonski does disclose a system that communicates a configuration change across a network to a management facility that is accessible through a network interface and an embedded webserver of a first imaging device, selects at least one other imaging device from a list of other imaging devices stored on the first imaging device and communicates the configuration change from the imaging device to the at least one other imaging device selected from the list of other imaging devices stored on the first imaging device (see figure 4 and the detailed action).

c. Schlonski fails to teach or disclose all elements of independent claim 15 (remarks, page 8).

In response to [c], Schlonski does indeed teach and disclose all the elements of independent claim 15 (see the action below).

d. Schlonski fails to teach or disclose all elements of independent claim 21 (remarks, page 8).

In response to [d], Schlonski does indeed teach and disclose all the elements of independent claim 21 (see the action below).

Art Unit: 2151

- e. Schlonski fails to teach or disclose all elements of independent claim 1 (remarks, page 9).

In response to [e], Schlonski in combination with Carcerano do indeed teach and disclose all the elements of independent claim 1 (see the action below).

- f. Carcerano fails to teach or suggest an imaging device adapted to store a configuration for the imaging device on a computer-readable media (remarks, page 10).

In response to [f], Please note that Carcerano reference is combined with Schlonski to show the inherent component of an imaging device i.e. a computer readable media coupled to a processor, whereas Schlonski explicitly discloses the imaging device adapted to store a configuration.

- g. Schlonski and Carcerano fail to teach all elements of independent claim 1.

In response to [g], Schlonski and Carcerano does indeed teach and disclose all the elements of independent claim 1 (see the action below).

For the at least reasons set forth above, the rejection is maintained.

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1-22 are presented for re-examination.

Specification

The specification is objected to under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to adequately teach how to make and use the invention, i.e., failing to provide an enabling disclosure.

The test to be applied under the written description portion of 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, is whether the disclosure of the application as originally filed reasonably conveys to the artisan that the inventor had possession at that time of later claimed subject matter. Vas-Cat, Inc. v. Mahurkar, 935 F. 2d 1555, 1565, 19 USPQ2d 111, 1118 (Fed. Cir. 1991), reh'rg denied (Fed. Cir. July 8, 1991) and reh'rg, en banc, denied (Fed. Cir. July 29, 1991).

The applicants have failed to provide an enabling disclosure in the detailed description of the embodiment. The specification is objected to under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to support the subject matter set forth in these claims.

Applicant's specification fails to provide an enabling disclosure (or simply does not support) for the following:

First, the system that communicates a configuration change across a network to a management facility that is accessible through a network interface and an embedded webserver of a first imaging device, selects at least one other imaging device from a list of other imaging devices stored on the first imaging device and communicates the configuration change from the imaging device to the at least one other imaging device selected from the list of other imaging devices stored on the first imaging device and the imaging device displaying the list of other

Art Unit: 2151

imaging devices as being **configured itself by the management facility** (as argued by the applicant).

Secondly, the recited limitation "...where the configuration is input by commands received across the network by a management facility on the imaging device that is accessible through the embedded webserver..."

Third, the recited limitation "...wherein the processor is adapted to transmit the configuration **to a network address of** at least one of the other imaging devices of the stored list..."

Fourth, the recited limitation "...wherein the **management facility and embedded web server...**" (Please note that the management facility is in form of an embedded webserver).

Fifth, the recited limitation "...selecting at least one other imaging device from a list of other imaging devices stored on the first imaging device by communicating across the network to the management facility of the first imaging device across the network..."

Sixth, the recited limitation "...communicating a configuration change **by surfing across a network with a web browser to a management facility accessible through** an embedded web server of a first imaging device" and "configuring one or more other imaging devices **from the management facility of the first imaging device** in response to the configuration change of the first imaging device..."

Seventh, the recited limitation "...wherein the configuration change is received across a network via a network management facility accessible through an embedded webserver of the first imaging device..."

There is no indication whatsoever in the specification of the management program or facility as being resident on the imaging device being configured through the imaging device's embedded webserver.

The specification merely describes the process wherein the administrator surfs to the address of the imaging device on the network with a web browser. Once connected to the embedded webserver of the desired imaging device, the administrator can manage it or upgrade its configuration utilizing the embedded webserver (of the imaging device) without requiring a specialized imaging device management facility. The command interface of the imaging device, that comprises the imaging device's management facility, is generated by the embedded webserver and displayed on the administrator's web browser (applicant specification, page 7 [0025]).

Further, applicant teaches, "at the management facility of the embedded webserver the administrator can also modify device information and configuration parameters by the modification and submission of HTML forms and inputs via the browser to the embedded webserver of the imaging device (specification, page 7 [0027])".

There is no indication in the specification of the fact that the administrator's system is indeed an imaging device with an embedded webserver or management facility and a web browser that would have enabled the self-configuration of the imaging device and/or other functions through the management facility (as argued by the applicant).

Applicant's specification simply refers to the administrator and the web browser for conducting the configuration and/or configuration change of the imaging devices through their

Art Unit: 2151

(imaging device's embedded web server or management facility) embedded webserver (see applicant specification, page 9-10, [0034-0035], fig. 2-4).

Hence, the above claimed and/or amended limitations presents the subject matter that was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the **first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112**:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

2. Claims 1-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, for the reasons set forth in the objection to the specification.

The following is a quotation of the **second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112**:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claims 1-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The amended limitations "...where the configuration is input **by commands received across the network by a management facility** on the imaging device that is accessible through the embedded web server" and "selecting at least one other imaging device from a list of other

imaging devices stored on the first imaging device by **communicating across the network to the management facility of the first imaging device across the network**” are unclear.

The first limitation renders the claim indefinite because it is unclear whether the configuration input are inputted and received from an external source or are inputted and received within an imaging device through the embedded web server.

The second limitation renders the claim indefinite because it is unclear whether the communications are within the imaging device utilizing the embedded web server or the communications are external utilizing the network.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

1. Claims 11-13, 15-16, 19-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Schlonski et al. (hereinafter Schlonski, Pub. No.: US 2002/0196451 A1).

As per claim 11, Schlonski discloses a method of configuring a plurality of imaging devices coupled to a network, the method comprising: communicating a configuration change across a network to management facility that is accessible through a network interface and an embedded webserver of a first imaging device (pg. 3 block #32, pg. 4 block #38, fig. 4 and fig. 3 item #310); selecting at least one other imaging device from a list of other imaging devices stored on the first imaging device by communicating across the network to the management

Art Unit: 2151

facility of the first imaging device across the network (fig. 4 and pg. 3 [0027], and based on applicants specification pg. 11 [0038-0039]) and communicating the configuration change from the first imaging device to the at least one other imaging device selected from a list of other imaging devices stored on the first imaging device (pg. 1 block #9, pg. 3 block #27 and fig. 3-4).

As per claim 12, Schlonski discloses the process of generating the list of other imaging devices and storing the list of other imaging devices in the first imaging device (pg. 3 block #27, pg. 2 block #15, fig. 2 item #106 and fig. 4).

As per claim 13, Schlonski discloses the process of generating the list of other imaging devices similar to the first imaging devices (pg. 1 block #9, pg. 3 block #27-29, 34 and fig. 4).

As per claim 15, Schlonski discloses a method of operating a plurality of imaging devices, the method comprising: communicating a configuration change by surfing across a network with a web browser to a management facility accessible through an embedded webserver of a first imaging device (pg. 3 [0027]); processing the configuration change on the first imaging device, thereby generating a configuration on the first imaging device (pg. 3 block #32, pg. 4 block #38 and fig. 3 item #310); and configuring one or more other imaging devices from the management facility of the first imaging device in response to the configuration change of the first imaging device, wherein the one or more other imaging devices are selected from a list stored on the first imaging device (pg. 4 block #40 and fig. 3-5).

As per claim 16, Schlonski discloses the process of configuring the one or more other imaging devices further by communicating the configuration of the first imaging device to the one or more other imaging devices (fig. 3-4).

As per claim 19, Schlonski discloses the process of communicating a configuration from an originating network device that is selected from group consisting of local network site, and a remote network site (fig. 4 and fig. 1).

As per claim 20, Schlonski discloses the process of communicating configuration from a network site that is another imaging device (fig. 3, fig. 4 and fig. 1).

As per claim 21, Schlonski discloses a computer-usable medium having computer readable instructions stored thereon for execution by a processor to perform a method comprising: processing a configuration change on a first imaging device, wherein the configuration is received across a network via a management facility accessible through an embedded webserver of the first imaging device (fig. 3 item #310); refereeing to a list of other imaging devices on the network stored in the first imaging device (fig. 4); and configuring at least one imaging device selected from the list via the management facility of the first imaging device in response to the configuration change of the first imaging device (fig. 5 and pg. 4 block #40 and fig. 3).

As per claim 22, Schlonski discloses the process of configuring at least one imaging device from a list using a configuration of the first imaging device (fig. 4: displays a list of printers to select the printer to be used as a template in configuring other printers, fig. 5: displays the printers to be selected in order to be cloned or configured by using template of other printer).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-4 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schlonski et al. (hereinafter Schlonski, Pub. No.: US 2002/0196451 A1) in view of Carcerano et al. (U. S. Patent No. 6,308,205 B1).

As per claim 1, Schlonski discloses an imaging device, comprising: a processor adapted for communication with a network using an embedded webserver (pg. 3 block #32 and applicant admitted prior art AAPA, pg. 2 block 7); wherein the processor is adapted to store a configuration for the imaging device on the computer-usable media, where the configuration is input by commands received across the network by a management facility on the imaging device that is accessible through the embedded webserver (pg. 3 block #35, pg. 3 [0027] and fig. 2 item #106 and AAPA pg. 2 block 7); wherein the processor is adapted to store a list of other imaging devices on the network in data depository (fig. 2 item #106 and fig. 4); and wherein processor is adapted to transmit the configuration to a network address of at least one of the other imaging devices of the stored list (fig. 3 item #306, 308 and pg. 3 block #36), however Schlonski does not disclose a device with a computer-usable media coupled to the processor (please note that the feature is inherent, however Carcerano is introduced as an evidence).

Carcerano, from the same field of endeavor explicitly discloses an imaging device comprising a processor for communication with a network using an embedded webserver and a computer-usable media coupled to the processor (fig. 4 item #91, 93, 95). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Carcerano as stated above with Schlonski in order to provide a computer-usable media coupled to the processor. One of ordinary skilled in the art would have been motivated because all of the networked devices are generally includes a processor and a computer-readable media (AAPA, pg. 2 block #7) and further as to provide storage to processor during execution of software applications (Carcerano, col. 8 L12-14).

As per claim 2, Schlonski discloses the process and system for discovering the list of other imaging devices from the network (pg. 3 block #27-28).

As per claim 3, Schlonski discloses the process for discovering other imaging devices from the network that are similar to the imaging device (fig. 2, fig. 3 item #304 and pg. 4 item #39).

As per claim 4, Schlonski does not explicitly disclose the process wherein the embedded webserver is a function of the processor in response to computer-readable instructions stored on the computer-usable media. Carcerano discloses the process wherein the processor loads process steps from a computer-readable medium into main memory and the processor then executes the stored process steps from main memory in order to execute application programs such as an HTTP server (read as processor executing an embedded webserver application in response to computer readable instructions, col. 8 L12-20). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the

teaching of Carcerano as stated above with Schlonski in order to execute the embedded webserver application. One of ordinary skilled in the art would have been motivated because it would have executed the application programs and/or software applications such as http server (an embedded webserver, col. 8 L14-20).

As per claim 8, Schlonski discloses the process wherein the configuration for transmission to at least one of the other imaging devices is sourced from an originating network device that is selected from the group consisting of imaging device, a local network site and a remote network site (fig. 1 and pg. 3 block #36 and fig. 4).

3. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schlonski et al. (hereinafter Schlonski, Pub. No.: US 2002/0196451 A1) in view of Carcerano et al. (U. S. Patent No. 6,308,205 B1), and further in view of Mathieson (Pub. No.: US 2002/0143915 A1).

As per claim 7, Schlonski in view of Carcerano discloses an imaging device with embedded webserver adapted to process of imaging device upgrade command (Schlonski, fig. 4-5 and pg. 3 block #32), however, Schlonski in view of Carcerano does not explicitly disclose the commands including upgrade firmware, upgrade software, upgrade supplemental information, online, offline, restart, reset, purge job, pause job, and manage job queue.

Mathieson discloses the process of managing job queues including the process of cancel/pause job and hold jobs (pg. 1 block #15, 18). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Schlonski in view of Carcerano to provide the following commands: upgrade firmware, upgrade software, upgrade supplemental information, online, offline, restart, reset, purge job, pause job, and manage job as this functions are well known in the art.

One of ordinary skilled in the art would have been motivated because it would have configured plurality of digital printers on a network and would have further provided a mechanism for managing print jobs by manipulating any of the jobs in the queues.

4. Claims 5-6 and 9-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schlonski et al. (hereinafter Schlonski, Pub. No.: US 2002/0196451 A1) in view of Carcerano et al. (U. S. Patent No. 6,308,205 B1), and further in view of Hawes (U. S. Patent No. 6,026,436).

As per claim 5, Schlonski in view of Carcerano does not explicitly disclose the process wherein the embedded webserver is adapted to process an upload of configuration selected from the group consisting of configuration parameters, configuration parameters with a mask, firmware, software, supplemental information, configuration parameters from a network site, configuration parameters with a mask from a network site, firmware from a network site, software from a network site, supplemental information from a network site. Hawes discloses the system wherein the properties form (read as configuration form) is posted to the device (uploaded, col. 9 L4-17) and embedded webserver of the destination device processes an upload of configuration and/or sets the relevant properties, with the http service (col. 9 L18-29 and fig. 5-7 and fig. 4 item #102: read as network site). Hawes further teaches that many more configuration values than those shown in form of fig. 6-7 may be provided (col. 8 L58-64). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Hawes and combine with Schlonski and Carcerano in order to process an upload of configuration data. One of ordinary skilled in the art would have been motivated so that the other network devices would have been configured in a most efficient and timely manner by copying the configuration and/or settings from one device to another.

As per claim 6, Schlonski in view of Carcerano does not explicitly disclose the process wherein the embedded webserver is adapted to download information from the group consisting of configuration parameters, configuration parameters with a mask, firmware, software, supplemental information, configuration parameters from a network site, configuration parameters with a mask from a network site, firmware from a network site, software from a network site, supplemental information from a network site. Hawes discloses the system wherein the embedded server is adapted to download information from a network site (fig. 4, fig. 6-7, col. 8 L30-58 and col. 9 L18-20). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Hawes and combine with Schlonski and Carcerano in order to download information. One of ordinary skilled in the art would have been motivated because of the same reasons as set forth in claim 5.

As per claim 10, Schlonski in view of Carcerano does not explicitly disclose the process of transmitting configuration to at least one other imaging device via a protocol that is selected from the group consisting http protocol, https protocol, printer mark-up language and a compatible imaging device communication protocol. Hawes, from the same field of endeavor discloses the process of sending configuration to other imaging device via http or https, SNMP (col. 7 L37-39) and Hawes further teaches that any other type of communication protocol could provide getting/setting functionality of servers (col. 8 L3-30 and fig. 4). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Hawes with Schlonski and Carcerano in order to send configuration via a compatible imaging device protocol. One of ordinary skilled in the art would have been motivated so that the plurality of network devices is configured efficiently. One of ordinary skilled in the art would

Art Unit: 2151

have also been motivated to use http as interfaces because of the following reasons: first, development costs are lower and deployment schedules shorter since the mechanism can be used by many clients without the necessity of writing the client display software (often referred to as "user interface" or UI) for each operating system and processor that clients use. Second, it is straightforward to define multi-lingual interfaces by storing the information in multiple languages on the server, permitting the server to be accessed in multiple languages by different clients concurrently. Third, upgrades or changes can be made to the print or document processing machine's capabilities without the inconvenience of the vendor developing new client display software and of the client having to install new software on every client computer for each such upgrade (Hawes, col. 3 L16-34).

As per claim 9, it does not teach or further define over the limitations in claims 5-6 and 10. Therefore, claim 9 is rejected for the same reasons as set forth in claims 5-6 and 10.

5. Claims 17-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Schlonski et al. (hereinafter Schlonski, Pub. No.: US 2002/0196451 A1) in view of Hawes (U. S. Patent No. 6,026,436).

As per claim 17-18, they recite the same limitations as in claims 5 and claim 7. Therefore, claims 17-18 are rejected for the same reasons as set forth in claims 5 and 7.

6. Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Schlonski et al. (hereinafter Schlonski, Pub. No.: US 2002/0196451 A1) in view of Mixer, Jr. (hereinafter Mixer, U. S. Patent No. 6,693,722 B1).

As per claim 14, Schlonski does not explicitly disclose the process of translating the configuration change to a printer protocol compatible with other imaging device prior to communicating the configuration change to that other imaging device.

Mixer, from the same field of endeavor discloses the process of converting the data stream (read as configuration data) from a protocol native to the device to the protocol compatible with the device (col. 1 L38-58). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Mixer as stated above with Schlonski in order to translate the configuration data to a printer compatible protocol data prior to communicating the configuration to the other device.

One of ordinary skilled in the art would have been motivated because it would have enabled the communications between network devices with different standards and protocols (Mixer, col. 1 L15-58).

Additional References

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- a. Barrett et al., U. S. Patent No. 5,323,393.
- b. Webb et al., Pub. No.: US 2002/0083342 A1.
- c. Levac et al., U. S. Patent No. 5,872,926.
- d. Chiles et al., U. S. Patent No. 6,167,567.

Art Unit: 2151

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to KAMAL B. DIVECHA whose telephone number is 571-272-5863. The examiner can normally be reached on Increased Flex Work Schedule.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Zarni Maung can be reached on 571-272-3939. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Kamal Divecha
Art Unit 2151
March 01, 2006.



ZARNI MAUNG
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER